DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 171 HE 032 143

AUTHOR	Leffel, Rob R.
TITLE	Public Policy and the Academy in an Era of Change.
PUB DATE	1999-04-00
NOTE	23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrators; College Faculty; College Students; Colleges; *Educational Attitudes; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Ethnic Bias; *Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; Leadership; Legislators; Public Policy; Research; School Business Relationship; Social Change; *State Officials; Universities

ABSTRACT

This study examined the attitudes of students, faculty, administrators, and policymakers in regard to higher education policy, in light of the challenges facing higher education institutions and specifically as they relate to the mission of the university as a research institution. In-depth ethnographic interviews were conducted with students, faculty, administrators, state officials, lobbyists, professional association leaders, and state legislators. Overall, the interviews demonstrated that because corporate America is putting more and more pressure on institutions to focus on applied research and to produce a workforce that will manage its firms, operate its factories, and design its plants, universities are perceived to have lost, or are in danger of losing, their connections to the kind of research that benefits society. The report concluded that universities must change the ways they communicate their mission and must accept the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership, and must also increase their competitiveness with other forms of education and training. (Contains 12 references.) (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PUBLIC POLICY AND THE ACADEMY IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

ED 432 171

by

Rob R. Leffel

128 East Chapman Road
Hewitt, TX 76643-3766
E-mail: rleffel@tamu.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Rob R. Leffel
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE 032 143

♦ Paper presented at the 1999 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 19-23, Montrèal, Canada. Comments, criticisms, and suggestions are welcomed. Please respond to the address or e-mail of the author listed above.

♦ This research was carried out under the auspices of the Creative and Scholarly Enhancement Grant Program, Texas A&M University, "The Responsive University Project," co-principal investigators, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Stan Carpenter. Some data also have been drawn from the "Higher Education in the 21st Century" research project, Association for the Study of Higher Education, principal investigator, Yvonna S. Lincoln.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PUBLIC POLICY AND THE ACADEMY IN AN ERA OF CHANGE

Academe is no stranger to critique. As far back as the colonial period, criticizing higher education has been something of a national pastime. Yet as the new millennium approaches, "public disaffection with American higher education seems to have generated a cacophony of popular criticism almost without historical precedent" (Lucas, 1994, p. XI). Works such as *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (Sykes, 1990), *The University in Ruins* (Readings, 1997), *Higher Education Under Fire* (Berube & Nelson, 1995), *Crisis in the Academy* (Lucas, 1996), and *Imposters in the Temple* (Anderson, 1996), along with numerous other books, articles, and other media suggest that society is deeply dissatisfied with our institutions of higher learning. The critics are suggesting that higher education is out of touch and falling short in meeting society's educational needs. Unfortunately, when studies such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) find that roughly half of all college graduates surveyed cannot summarize a newspaper article, calculate a ten percent tip for lunch, or interpret a bus schedule (Lucas, 1996), it suggests the critics might be right.

Numerous challenges face higher education as the new millennium approaches: a strident and critical popular press, a citizenry focused on accountability in all public expenditures, a new emphasis on budgets tied to performance indicators, substantial pressure on state appropriations, newly imposed admission and financial aid policy changes, challenges to

the tenure system, and shifting societal demographics. If we are to effectively address these challenges we must consider how those in key policy making positions are constructing higher education. The future strategies of these key individuals will impact the academy in the coming decades. Their interpretations of popular perception and need profoundly influence higher education. This paper—which is a culmination of their responses—will explore how those in key policy making positions construct higher education, interpret public perception, and ultimately influence policy.

Methodology

In order to map a far-reaching set of perspectives, multiple intensive interviews were conducted with a wide range of higher education constituencies that included, but were not limited to: faculty, students, campus presidents, chancellors, state commissioners, higher education lobbyists, national professional association leaders, and state legislators. The data gathered from these interviews are represented in two primary bodies of work: the *1994 ASHE Task Force on the Study of Higher Education in the 21st Century* and the 1998 Texas A&M University Research Enhancement Programs funded study, *The Responsive University: What Do Our Publics Really Want?*

In strict adherence with naturalistic-constructivist inquiry models and methodologies (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1985),

systematic and well-explicated ethnographic methods were utilized in gathering and analyzing data to ensure this study's fidelity, rigor, and trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Constructing Mission

Few would disagree that the face of higher education is changing, but how change will manifest itself and what type of impact it will have on the academy's mission is still open to discussion. The critics disagree and little consensus can be derived from futurists. The only certainty is that change is inevitable. The impact of this change on the mission of the university has many in higher education concerned. Specifically, they fear realignment could impair the ability of institutions to fulfill their role as research universities. One concern is that this could ultimately lead to specialization within disciplines, thus diluting institutional energies. As observed by one college president:

> Does that shatter the American university as we know it? Do we indeed have to specialize? Are we going to finally bite the bullet and say that the American university, as we know it, is going to have to divide itself . . . in other words, the age-old argument about whether the research university is informed by great teaching and research informs great teaching or vice versa is not the point. The point is, can you get great research with a divergent and different purpose? (PMB.33)

When institutions engage in divergent purposes they quickly find themselves competing with other institutions, agencies, and organizations that are better equipped to provide specialized services. These different enterprises can often confuse an institution's mission. With muddled missions institutional energies are less focused and can become obscure. One state commissioner believes higher education has already gone too far in assuming too many roles:

> For me, the fundamental bottom line is that it's nice for the university to do a lot that it is doing now, but there are certain things that only the university does. There are certain values that only the university stands for and I think we should be very cautious about compromising or losing any of those things for the sake of doing something that a lot of other institutions, organizations, and agencies in society already do. (MS.039)

If universities are to maintain their focus as research institutions, then their missions must be clearly stated and understood. Otherwise, policy-related concerns can arise over fears that as those within the academy become more attuned to the needs and rewards of the economic marketplace, profit-oriented priorities may replace academic ones (Campbell, 1997). Initiatives such as those with business and industry are good examples of programs that can possibly confuse missions and distract institutions and should therefore be entered into cautiously.

Corporate America is putting more and more pressure on institutions of higher education to produce a workforce to manage their firms, operate their factories, and design their plants. When these ideas of applied research fall on receptive ears in the legislature, the popular media, and the general public, they can profoundly impact the face of higher education. As the press for more applied research becomes intense the diminution of basic research in research universities may prove to be problematic. If we are to maintain the integrity of our institutions, we must make the mission of the research university clear to the public and the corporate world. As stated by one professor:

> Universities have always had the mission of responding to the needs of the corporate world, but they've also had an additional mission to create new knowledge and expand on knowledge in areas which may not have direct applicability at this point in time to the corporate world. The university is the only institution in society that has this mandate. If we give it up, if we are only the "monkey on the stick," and if we are only responsive to another group, we are going to fail miserably. I think that many of the things that have eventually served the corporate world are discovered through untargeted, basic research kinds of inquiries. (Pip.5)

Perhaps the greatest concern to academic leaders is that higher education will be unable or unwilling to put forth the energies necessary to clearly articulate its mission in relative terms that business and

industry can appreciate, since it is the concept of knowledge discovery and pursuit that is so often the stumbling block to effective communication with those outside the academy. The corporate world generally views basic research—the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of knowledge—as impractical and a waste of resources. In many cases the ivy walls of the academy are viewed with contemptuous eyes. As observed by a graduate student: "We've had an anti-intellectual attitude in this country, but I think we have to move from a model or a value system that says, 'you can work it out by the sweat of your brow' to a model that says, 'you can accomplish it with the power of your brain'" (McC.5.5).

This is especially true as this country moves from a manufacturing base to a knowledge/information base. Unless our publics have an understanding of knowledge production, what goes into it, what it means to the university, how it ties to the surrounding community, to the corporate world and to society in general, it will be virtually impossible to rally support for many of our intellectual pursuits. This does not mean that every university should jump on the utilitarian bandwagon, but it does mean that universities have lost or are in danger of losing the connection to the kinds of traditional research which benefit society and the corporate world. Therefore, when the legislature, the popular media, and the general public pressure higher education to replace traditional forms of inquiry in favor of more applied methods, it is up to the

institution to stand steadfast in its endeavors. As expressed by a retired national association leader:

> I remember my first day as a student at Oxford listening to a lecture from one of the Lords, master of Wooster College. He said that the genius of Oxford was that it was never out of step with society at any particular time. When people looked at him in bewilderment, trying to figure out what he meant; he said that was because Oxford never makes any effort to get into step with society at any particular time. I think there's a lot to be said for that. It seems like every institution in society is becoming more and more transient, ephemeral, and is constantly changing. They are trying to guess the next trend and be in front of the line. I think the University could provide a great deal of the stability that changing organizations need. That is: asking the important questions; training people; and providing the skills that seem (over the long haul) to be valuable—literacy, mathematics, the ability to think and analyze. I don't think that those things will ever become outdated. Whereas, if we try to bet on the next thing that may be needed at some point in the future, we may bet wrong. I think it's very likely that we will bet on losers and I'm worried about what we might sacrifice in the way of jumping on new bandwagons. (MS.009)

To avoid these external pressures we must speak to our constituents in relative terms. We must educate the public about the job universities

do. One higher education lobbyist believes, "If we are to be more competitive, we have to be more adept and have a broader knowledge base and show more respect for advanced knowledge. Consequently, the population is going to have to be educated to a higher degree about the job we do" (Pip.4). Otherwise, if we fail in this respect we are ultimately likely to fail in our mission—not by choice, but by constraints placed upon us by our own constituents.

Framing Public Discourse

We must change the way we communicate. Public and corporate trust is waning and if we are to retain the support and confidence of our constituents we must better articulate the appropriateness and adaptability of our missions within a historical framework. The importance of this framework is emphasized when public leaders make policy decisions. As a professor explains:

> When legislators, members of the business community, or government officials criticize colleges and universities for not being productive or not paying enough attention to certain programs they forget that the current expectations that are prevalent on our campuses, the models that faculty follow, were not created in a vacuum. They resulted from many people in society laying out expectations over a period of 20, 30, 40 years. (Lov.12)

Higher education policies are not constructed in isolation. Administrative decisions made in institutions are based on historical precedents and practices that are directly tied to public need, but without a historical understanding of mission, the modern university can appear to many outside the academy as out-dated and out of touch with a changing society. As another professor explains:

> One of the things that needs to be said about public perception is that the perspective from which many view the academic world stems from circumstances occurring within a unique decade. Between 1955 and 1965 there were three major social developments, each one absolutely unprecedented in American history: Sputnik and the technology race with the former Soviet Union; the baby boom and the Civil Rights movement; and the GI Bill. There was this period where there was an incredible social expectation for what the role of the university and higher education in general should be. We built the system quickly. It was an incredible era, an unusual off-the-chart time. (Edg.9)

The belief that higher education is out of touch and out-dated is best explained by a paradox in perception. American higher education has been governed by two contrary sensibilities since World War II. The first is a sense of sustaining mission, a belief that, at its core, higher education is unchanging—its purposes established, its educational and intellectual values well honed, its costs predominantly fixed. Clark Kerr and the

Carnegie Commission best illustrate this celebration of constancy in their work produced more than two decades ago:

> Taking, as a starting point, 1530, when the Lutheran Church was founded, some 66 institutions that existed then still exist today in the Western world in recognizable forms: the Catholic Church, the Lutheran Church, the parliaments of Iceland and the Isle of Man, and 62 universities . . . They have experienced wars, revolutions, depressions, and industrial transformations, and have come out less changed than almost any other segment of their societies. (Zemsky & Massy, 1995, p. 45)

Ironically, the academy has been the prime contributor to every major scientific and technological breakthrough of the 20th century. This is the second sensibility, the celebration of change—change as a result of evolving values and attitudes, change in pursuit of transitioning national agendas, change for its own sake. It is this capacity for change that seems most at risk. There is a growing sense that what banks, retailers, manufacturers, insurance companies, hospitals, and governments have undertaken has somehow remained beyond the reach and will of higher education. The perception is that the academy has become too set in its ways to change—the last holdout against the restructuring that is recasting the American enterprise (Zemsky & Massy, 1995).

This paradox in perception, this idea that the academy is impervious to change when in actuality higher education has been the impetus for

most significant scientific and technological change of the 20th century, is cause for concern. A disparity between public comprehension of institutional mission and assumptions made by those within the academy about what the public perceives can lead to confusion, frustration, and ultimately mistrust.

However, it is impossible to talk about change without recognizing that it may be very different for different kinds of institutions. The most important of these changes will likely involve the research university because these institutions are highly visible—both heavily influenced by political trends and heavily influenced by other institutions—but also because of the special and pivotal role they play with respect to the rest of the enterprise (Kennedy, 1995). This high visibility is the very reason many public leaders turn to universities for direction in addressing societal issues and formulating policy.

Mediating Public Policy

As society braces for the coming millennium many will look to our universities for direction in addressing social issues. Our institutions of higher learning are likely to be called upon to act as guides and mediators to public policy. Clark Kerr (1997) tells us that, "Modern higher education is a product of the Enlightenment period with its emphasis on reason, on science and technology, and on efficient management. The

Enlightenment was neglectful of tradition and of faith and failed to develop any general ethical and moral systems of its own" (p. 348). But if universities are to act as guides or mediators, then at least in part, they must be willing to engage in discussions of morality and ethics. One college president believes no other institution is better prepared to provide the needed leadership:

> I think higher education is the institution in this country that is best equipped to lend moral leadership in formulating public policy. We're supposed to be the repository of research and scholarship and intellectual inquiry, and I know of no other institution that is better equipped to provide the needed leadership. (FS.4-5.9)

By accepting the academy as a repository of research, scholarship and intellectual inquiry we also accept the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership. As one professor explains, "If you're in the education business, I think you have to accept these dimensions of education because of the sheer nature of the business" (FS.10.33). In our current environment of acute political sensitivity, individual rights, and propensity for litigation, discussions of morality and ethics raise eyebrows, but as one state representative observes, higher education is uniquely qualified to meet the challenge:

> The church lends leadership in the spiritual sphere and the government lends leadership in policy and finance, but what institution is better equipped to provide leadership in research and

inquiry and to formulate and articulate policy? I see higher education as the institution in this country that is uniquely qualified to provide moral leadership although it often shirks such responsibility. (FS.5.10)

Why has higher education previously disposed of this responsibility? One possible reason is the inability to evoke substantive change within institutions. The academy has a long and historic tradition of maintaining a status quo. Another state representative comments on this immovable force in higher education: "One of the primary problems is the inertia within the system. Whenever we attempt to invoke change we are either fighting against the very entrenched system of governance or fighting for the almighty dollar. Institutions of higher learning are closed cultures and the stakeholders are extremely resistant to relinquish power" (RJD.2).

In order for us to bring about change and participate meaningfully in policy, we must be able to communicate on many levels with constituents both inside and outside of the academy. Higher education leaders need the ability to balance institutional values with the needs of the public and surrounding communities. Whether it is implementing change or providing moral leadership, as one professor observes, the challenge lies in equalizing interests:

Higher education leaders need a vision of what is in the public interest as distinguished from the institutional interest. My view is

> that we should look first to the public interest as a greater goal, and second to the institutional interest with the understanding that the two are not always identical. When the two conflict, education leaders should dedicate themselves to the public good. (FS.9.27)

Without this dedication to public interest we run the risk of betraying public trust. Without a dedication to institutional interest we run the risk of betraying our history and dedication to free scholarship. Juggling the interests of both can leave leaders frustrated and confused. It takes outstanding moral character and fortitude to make the hard decisions on a daily basis. It takes sound moral and ethical leadership to serve the interests of both effectively. This type of leadership is more than the espousal of moral and ethical behavior. As a former president notes, "It is about choosing people, creating a climate of trust and respect, taking risks, and being predictable" (McC.8.8). As a mediator of public policy, higher education must expect its officers, administrators, and leaders to be individuals of the highest moral character and fortitude dedicated equally to institutional and public interests.

Staving Off Competition

At an accelerating pace, outside institutions, agencies and organizations are making inroads into domains previously held solely by the academy. The corporate sector is pushing for more leverage over curriculum. Legislatures are seeking alternatives to traditional forms of

training and preparation. The competition for state resources is intensifying and higher education's ability to compete with health care, public education, criminal justice, and social services seemingly diminishes each biennium. As one chancellor notes:

> Higher education is in for some real tough competition, especially if you look at the claimants to state budgets. I don't see us faring very well in that competition in the next 10 years. Almost everything else, prisons, health care, etc. has a stronger claim in the crunch. (Edg.5)

If higher education is to effectively compete for revenues, then we must change public views. Few would disagree that for the most part higher education has enjoyed favor among the public, but as society looks for accountability in the utilization of state resources, favor will not be enough. A professor observes:

> Most of the public is generally supportive. People are nostalgic about their college experience. They are inclined to see us favorably. But I believe that if we don't change the way we think, the way we're organized and we don't commit to new roles for faculty, many of the functions that we now perform are going to be pre-empted by other institutions. (Lov.8)

A nostalgic public is not enough to satisfy corporate America or stave off other claimants to state support. The public must come to view

higher education as a vital resource, essential to a productive and healthy society. One college president ponders the future of legislative support:

> Our ideas of resource allocation are going to have to change. Either we give up things, or we're going to have to work on a different distributional system. We must change our emphasis on what's important and what's not important, then we must put the resources into it. (KB.4.15)

Many of our key policymakers tell us public opinion, more than any other factor, is the reason higher education is so often asked to sacrifice resources in favor of other projects. State leaders are forced to reallocate these valuable resources based not on actual need, but on perceived need. A state senator explains how the force of public opinion impacts the allocation of resources:

> These forces affect higher education because we in the state legislature think of higher education as a resource which can be allocated—and then, by implication, ask how this particular resource will be reallocated. (KB.3.12)

When higher education is viewed as a tangible good and is forced to compete for resources with dissimilar enterprises, it finds itself in the unfortunate position of operating under a corporate model. A model in which debt-to-asset ratios take priority over free scholarship and intellectual inquiry. This is very worrisome to many in higher education. The pitfalls of an industrialized academy shake the very foundation of the

institution. Alarmingly, this industrialization is already visible on many levels, "We see admissions officers who speak with intense authority about marketing and we hear enthusiastic talk about productivity enhancement and Total Quality Management" (Kennedy, 1995, p. 11). If our institutions are to make themselves more accessible to the population and avoid institutional corporatism, then we must come up with strategies to better market our enterprise. We can no longer count on a nostalgic public view, a strong economy, or inertia to carry us forward into the next millennium.

Summary

We are entering another time of great change in American higher education, the results of which are far from certain. There are numerous challenges facing higher education as the new millennium approaches: a strident and critical popular press, a citizenry focused on accountability in all public expenditures, a new emphasis on budgets tied to performance indicators, substantial pressure on state appropriations, newly imposed admission and financial aid policy changes, challenges to the tenure system, and shifting societal demographics. In order to address these challenges we must consider how those in key policy making positions construct higher education, interpret public perception, and ultimately influence policy. The respondents in this study which included state commissioners, higher education lobbyists, national professional

association leaders, state and federal legislatures, chancellors, campus presidents, faculty, and students made the following observations:

- Corporate America is putting more and more pressure on institutions of higher education to produce a workforce to manage their firms, operate their factories, and design their plants. As the press for more applied research becomes intense the diminution of basic research in research universities may likely prove to be problematic in the long run. When this idea of applied research falls on receptive ears in the legislature and general public it profoundly impacts the face of higher education. If we are to maintain our institution's integrity we must make our missions clear to the public and the corporate world. Otherwise, if we fail in this respect we are ultimately likely to fail in our mission—not by choice, but by constraints placed upon us by our own constituents.
- Universities are perceived to have lost or are in danger of losing the connection to the kind of research which benefits society. Unless our publics have an understanding of knowledge production, what goes into it, what it means to the university, how it ties to the surrounding community, to the corporate world, and to society in general, it will be virtually impossible to rally support for many of our intellectual pursuits. When the legislature, the popular media, and the general public pressure higher education to replace traditional forms of inquiry in favor of more applied methods it must be left up to the institution to determine which benefits the larger community.

- We must change the way we communicate our missions. Public and corporate trust is waning and if we are to retain the support and confidence of our constituents we must better articulate the appropriateness and adaptability of our missions within a historical framework. Nowhere is this framework more important than when public leaders make policy decisions. Administrative decisions made in institutions are based on historical precedences and practices that were and are directly tied to public need, but without a historical understanding of mission, the modern university can appear to many as out-dated and out of touch. A clear, concise understanding of mission and how the modern university fits into the larger society is essential to ensure the future of the academy with its historic missions in tact.
- As a repository of research, scholarship, and intellectual inquiry, higher education must accept the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership. As society braces for the coming millennium, many will look to our universities for direction in addressing complex social issues. Our institutions of higher learning are likely to be called upon to act as guides and mediators to public policy. If universities are to assume this responsibility, they must be comfortable engaging in discussions of morality, ethics, and principles.
- If our institutions are to make themselves more accessible to the populace and change attitudes about the academy, then we must come up with strategies to increase our competitiveness. We can no longer

count on a nostalgic public view, a strong economy, or inertia within the system to compensate for our deficiencies. Outside institutions, agencies and organizations are making inroads into domains previously held solely by the academy. The corporate sector is pushing for more leverage over curriculum and the legislature is seeking alternatives to traditional forms of training and preparation from private enterprises. The competition for state resources is intensifying and higher education's ability to compete is diminishing. Few would disagree that for the most part higher education has historically enjoyed favor among the public, but if higher education is to effectively compete for revenues public views and attitudes must not be taken for granted.

At no time has the role of education had the opportunity to more profoundly serve society and impact the lives of its constituents. The value of an education has never been greater or its ability to serve as an impetus for change more apparent. In a letter to William Charles Jarvis on September 28, 1820, Thomas Jefferson described the role education must play in a free and democratic society: "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion." □

References

Anderson, M. (1996). Imposters in the temple: A blueprint for improving higher education in America. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institutional Press.

Berube, M., & Nelson, C. (1995). Higher education under fire: Politics, economics, and the crisis of the humanities. New York, NY: Routledge.

Campbell, T.I.D. (1997). Public policy for the 21st century: Addressing potential conflicts in university-industry collaboration. The Review of Higher Education, 20(4), 357-379.

Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). Doing naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. 132-151.

Kennedy, D. (1995). Another century's end, another revolution for higher education. Change, 27(3), 8-15.

Kerr, C. (1997). Speculations about the increasingly indeterminate future of higher education in the United States. The Review of Higher Education, 20(4), 345-356.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. 289-331.

Lucas, C.J. (1994). American higher education: A history. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press. XI.

Lucas, C.J. (1996). Crisis in the academy: Rethinking higher education in America. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press. 203.

Readings, B. (1997). The university in ruins. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sykes, C.J. (1990). Profscam: Professors and the demise of higher education. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Zemsky, R., & Massy, W.F. (1995). Expanding perimeters, melting cores, and sticky functions: Toward an understanding of our current predicaments. Change, 27(6), 45-49.